

**REMARKS**

This Amendment, submitted in response to the Office Action dated January 13, 2005, is believed to be fully responsive to each point of rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-16 are pending in the present application.

**I. Preliminary Matters**

The Examiner has objected to Figures 8A and 8B because they are not labeled as "Prior Art". Applicant has labeled Figures 8A and 8B as Prior Art. Consequently, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to the Figures be withdrawn.

Also, the Examiner has objected to claim 14 due to a minor informality. Claim 14 has been amended as indicated above. Such changes are not made in view of the prior art, and do not narrow the scope of the claims. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to claim 14 be withdrawn.

**II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-5, 8-12, 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,209,424 to Fischer et al. ("Fischer").

Claims 1, 9, and 16 have been amended to recite "wherein the protruding portion extends in a substantially perpendicular direction from a bottom surface of the recessed portion, and has a substantially frame shape in a plane view," which is not disclosed in Fischer.

In particular, Fischer fails to teach or suggest that the recessed portion 64 has a protruding portion with an outer periphery that extends in a substantially perpendicular direction

from the bottom surface of the recessed portion. Rather, Fischer merely discloses that the bottom surface of the recessed portion 64 is curved or sloped towards the edges 66, and fails to teach any additional “protruding portion” which extends, in a substantially perpendicular direction, from the curved or sloped surface.

Consequently, claims 1, 9 and 16 and their dependent claims should be deemed allowable.

### **III. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

The Examiner has rejected claims 6, 7, 13 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Fischer in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,717,771 to Morita et al. (“Morita”)

Since claims 6, 7, 13 and 14 are dependent upon one of claims 1 or 9, and Morita fails to cure the deficient teachings of Fischer, in regard to claims 1 and 9, claims 6, 7, 13 and 14 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

### **IV. Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. Application No.: 10/670,369


Attorney Docket No.: Q77302

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE  
23373  
CUSTOMER NUMBER

 Paula Tulino Reg. 33102  
Allison M. Tulino  
Registration No. 48,294

Date: April 13, 2005

### **AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

Figures 8a and 8b are attached as Prior Art.

Attachment: Figures 8a and 8b properly labeled as Replacement Sheet